

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on October 29, 2007. Claims 1-16 are pending in the current application. Claims 1-16 were rejected.

Claim Objections

The Office objects to claims 1-4, 11, and 14. The Applicant has corrected these claims consistent with the recommendations made in the Office Action. In claims 1 and 2, the word "the" has been deleted before "panel" and replaced with "a" to provide the proper antecedent basis. The extra period found at the end of claim 3 has been deleted. In claim 4, the phrase "of the or each fold line" has been amended to read "of the fold line." Claims 11 and 14 have been amended to begin with an uppercase "A." Finally, claim 11 has also been amended to indicate that claim 11 depends upon claim 9, as had been assumed by the Office.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 15-16 were rejected as being indefinite for failing to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. Claims 15-16 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 8-11, and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Helmetsie, *et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2005/0086736). The Applicant believes that the Office incorrectly applies Helmetsie as an anticipating reference.

The Helmetsie application was filed on October 24, 2003. However, the Applicant claims priority to October 22, 2003, the date on which the Applicant filed the priority application in New Zealand (NZ 529076), as provided in the Notice of Acceptance of Application Under 35 U.S.C. 371 and 37 CFR 1.495 issued by the USPTO.

Thus, the Applicant submits that Helmetsie is not a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection based on the Helmetsie reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helmsie. Claims 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helmsie in view of Salach (U.S. Pat. No. 5,671,489).

As described above, the Helmsie reference is not prior art to the present application. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw each of these rejections. As Helmsie is not prior art for the reasons stated above, the Office cannot use it as the basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are considered to be in condition for allowance, and the Applicant respectfully requests that a notice of allowance for these claims be issued.

A one month extension of time is believed to be necessary in connection with the filing of this response. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the fee for this one month extension of time, as well as any additional fees that are required or that may be due on this application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17, to Deposit Account 17-0055. The Commissioner is also authorized to treat this amendment and any future reply in this matter requiring a petition for an extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

John Hatrick-Smith

Dated February 28, 2008

By: 

Terri S. Flynn
Attorney for Applicant
Quarles & Brady LLP
Reg. No. 41,756
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5229